

REMARKS

Applicant herewith proposes a redlined drawing correction consisting of the replacement of drawing sheet 3/10. The correction consists of introducing, by the reference numeral 7, the seat base shown by Fig. 3. Applicant submits that, by this correction, the Examiner's objection to the drawings is rendered moot.

Applicant proposes amendments to the specification, namely introduction of the required headings and sub-headings and correction of the abstract by deleting the indication "Fig. 1". It is submitted that the Examiner's objections to the specification are now rendered moot.

Applicant also submits an amended claim 15, re-drafted in independent form. It is submitted that the Examiner's claim objection pertaining to improper dependent form of this claim is thereby rendered moot.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the fruitful observations concerning the scope of protection and in particular the difficulty in defining the claimed locking device without referring to features pertaining to other parts of the seat. In consideration thereof, Applicant cancels claims 1-14, without prejudice, and files herewith a new set of claims 17-29, having amended claim 15 as the base claim. The Examiner will readily note that new dependent claims 17 to 29 merely take up the features previously recited in dependent claims 2-14.

Amended claim 15 is now specifically directed to a seat for the transportation of a passenger in an installation for amusement parks. Claim 15, as amended, recites that the device for locking the legs of the passenger comprises two flaps mounted at an end portion of said support 11. This feature was previously recited in claim 1 and thus does

not introduce any fresh matter. Claim 15, as amended, further recites that the two flaps are mounted for articulation between an open position and a closed position. Applicant submits that this feature is clearly supported throughout the specification. Finally, claim 15, as amended, recites that the flaps co-operate with portions of the seat base so as to encircle the legs of a seated passenger in the closed position. This feature finds support in paragraph [0024] of the specification.

US 6,349,993 (Walsh) discloses a lumbar spinal alignment seat for people suffering from back pain. US 6,123,392 (Alfred et al.) discloses a chiropractic adjusting chair for aiding in the manipulation of various areas of the spine of a patient by a health professional. US 5,342,116 (Walton) discloses an anti-slump chair to be used by workers such as programmers spending long periods thereon, for allowing to maintain the lower end of the spine in an erect position and relieve strain on the back. Thus, all of the three devices disclosed by these three documents belong to the medical/paramedical field. Thus, the claimed invention, specifically directed to a seat for the transportation of a passenger in an installation for amusement parks, and not being directed to seats of any other kind, is novel over the devices disclosed by the three aforementioned prior art references.

Furthermore, the field of medical/paramedical devices is far afield from the field of amusement park installations. Those of ordinary skill in the art would not consider disclosures pertaining to the medical field when conceiving amusement park installations.

Furthermore, the device of the present invention is intended to hold and block passengers in the travelling vehicle of these amusement park installations despite the speeds and accelerations to which the passengers are subjected, so as to prevent any risk of ejection of the passenger during travel (see paragraph [0004] of the specification).


Thus, the technical problem to be solved by the present invention is totally different from the technical program solved by the devices of the three prior art references, and one of ordinary skill would not take such references into consideration upon conceiving his device.

It may be further observed that the device according to the present invention is intended to block the position of the passenger during the few minutes of a ride, whereas the three devices of the prior art references are intended to sustain the user during prolonged periods.

In summary, Applicant submits that those of ordinary skill in the art would by no means consider taking any teaching from the above three prior art references upon building a locking device for an amusement park installation passenger seat. Therefore, the claimed invention is not obvious over the same three references.

In view of the above, it is believed that the claimed invention as defined by the amended claims is patentably distinguishable over the prior art made of record, and favorable re-consideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Clifford W. Browning
Reg. No. 32,201
Woodard, Emhardt et al. LLP
Bank One Center/Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137
(317) 634-3456